



July 1, 2008

Unit 5, California Highway Patrol Officer Salary Survey

Department of Personnel Administration
Labor Relations Division
Office of Financial Management and Economic Research
1515 S Street, North Building, Suite 400
Sacramento, California 95811



Table of Contents

Overview	1
Labor Agreement Survey Requirement.....	1
Government Code Section 19827 Survey Requirement	1
Survey Methodology	1
Survey Results.....	3
Agreement between State of California and California Association of Highway Patrolmen, Article VI, Section 15(a).....	Attachment 1
Government Code Section 19827 Survey Requirement	Attachment 2
Description of Survey Process Pursuant to Government Code Section 19827.....	Attachment 3
Survey Lag Computation	Attachment 4

Overview

This salary survey is prepared by the Department of Personnel Administration (DPA) in accordance with the bargaining agreement between the State of California and the California Association of Highway Patrolmen (CAHP), covering collective bargaining Unit 5, Highway Patrol.

Labor Agreement Survey Requirement

The labor agreement between the State of California and the CAHP has a term of July 3, 2006 through July 2, 2010. Attachment 1 displays Article VI, Section 15(a) of the agreement. It requires the State to continue providing California Highway Patrol Officers with general salary increases as required by Government Code 19827. The salary increase is determined by the compensation survey as referenced in Government Code Section 19827.

Government Code Section 19827 Survey Requirement

Attachment 2 presents this code section which requires the State and CAHP to jointly and annually

- survey five specific public law enforcement organizations, and calculate the estimated average total compensation
- conduct the survey using the methodology described in the “Description of Survey Process Pursuant to Government Code 19827 Regarding the Recruitment and Retention of California Highway Patrol Officers” dated July 1, 2001
- project average total compensation ahead to July 1 of the year in which the survey is conducted

The government code also identifies the components of total compensation to be measured, and indicates that total compensation should include retirement contributions made by the employer on behalf of the employee.

Survey Methodology—Description of Survey Process Pursuant to Government Code Section 19827

Attachment 3 displays the survey methodology, including the law enforcement organizations and position classifications to be surveyed. The methodology requires:

- That the survey measure and report on salary range maximum, patrol bonuses, seniority pay (also known as longevity or retention pay), physical

- performance pay, Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and other education incentives, and the employee contribution to retirement¹.
- The use of an average entry age of 24 years, when the employee's retirement contribution rate varies based on age in the surveyed organizations.
 - The CAHP to verify the survey compensation and staffing data collected by the DPA.
 - The DPA and CAHP will finalize survey findings by March 31 of each year as data is projected to July 1. A labor agreement Side Letter agreement provides that if an agency for which a projection has been made resolves its contract after March 31 but before the State Controller's cut off date for the July pay period, then the survey must be adjusted to reflect the actual figures of the new agreement.
 - The DPA to provide survey information on an Excel spreadsheet.

The methodology identifies the following surveyed organizations and classifications, and indicates the survey's intent is to survey the classification that most closely matches the California Highway Patrol (CHP) Officer, Range A.

Organization	Surveyed Classification
San Francisco Police Department	Police Officer Q2 ²
San Diego Police Department	Police Officer II
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department	Deputy Sheriff
Los Angeles Police Department	Police Officer II ³
Oakland Police Department	Police Officer
California Highway Patrol	CHP Officer, Range A

¹ Government Code Section 19827(a)(1) requires that total compensation include retirement contributions made by the employer on behalf of the employee. The Description of the Survey Process pursuant to GC 19827 does not require that total compensation include retirement contributions made by the employer on behalf of the employee. Per past agreement between CAHP and DPA, the survey follows the Description of the Survey Process requirement.

² In the Description of the Survey Process Pursuant to GG 19827 document, the surveyed classification is Police Officer III Q4. This is the Police Officer having a POST Advanced Certificate. However, per past agreement between CAHP and DPA, the surveyed class was changed to Police Officer Q2, which is the officer having the POST Basic Certificate. To meet the intent of the Survey Methodology, the Police Officer Q2 more closely matches the California Highway Patrol Officer, Range A.

³ In the Survey Methodology, the surveyed classification is Police Officer II. However, per past agreement between CAHP and DPA, the weighted average salary is computed based on the combined count of Police Officer I, II and III incumbents. The reason is that the Field Training Officer function of the Police Officer III duties is the same as the Field Training Officer function of the CHP Officer, Range A, duties. The Police Officer III class is an assignment to a higher pay grade for a position carrying greater responsibility or requiring greater expertise. The Police Officer I is the cadet class.

The methodology determines the percent by which the California Highway Patrol Officer weighted total compensation leads or lags the combined, weighted average total compensation of the five surveyed organizations.

Attachment 4 displays the computation for the CHP Officers' lag in total compensation behind the surveyed organizations. The survey methodology is summarized as follows:

- The survey individually weights the patrol bonus, seniority, physical performance, and education incentive pays for each surveyed organization and the CHP Officer by the number of officers receiving those pays in each organization.
- For the five surveyed organizations as a group, the survey collectively weights the patrol bonus, seniority, physical performance, and education incentive pays and maximum base salary and employee contribution to retirement by the total officers in the five organizations. The result is the weighted compensation subtotal before subtracting the employee contribution to retirement.
- For the CHP Officer, the survey combines the weighted maximum salary and weighted special pays to determine the weighted compensation subtotal before subtracting the employee contribution to retirement.
- For the five surveyed organizations and the CHP Officer, the survey subtracts the weighted employee contribution to retirement from the compensation subtotal resulting in total compensation.
- The CHP Officer total compensation and surveyed organizations' total compensation are compared to determine the percent by which the CHP Officer leads or lags the surveyed organizations' total compensation.
- A CHP Officer lag, rounded to 1/10th percent, becomes the CHP Officer salary increase at July 1, 2007.

Survey Results

The survey produced a 4.1% salary increase at July 1, 2008, for California Highway Patrol Officers. This was the result of the CHP Officer total compensation lagging the weighted average compensation of the surveyed organizations by 4.05%.

ARTICLE VI – SALARIES

15. Salary Definitions

a. General Wage Increases

Effective July 1 of each fiscal year covered by the term of this agreement, (July 1, 2007, July 1, 2008, July 1, 2009, and July 1, 2010), the State and CAHP agree to continue providing for general wage increases as required by Government Code 19827. This means that employees shall receive a general salary increase based on the agreed upon difference of weighted average of the total compensation salary survey as referenced in Government Code Section 19827 and the weighted average salary of the total compensation for the CHP Officer using the survey methodology and definitions of total compensation currently in place on the date of this agreement.

19827 (a)

- (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, in order to recruit and retain the highest qualified employees, the state shall pay sworn members of the California Highway Patrol who are rank-and-file members of State Bargaining Unit 5 the estimated average total compensation for each corresponding rank for the Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office, San Diego Police Department, Oakland Police Department, and San Francisco Police Department. Total compensation shall include base salary, educational incentive pay, physical performance pay, longevity pay, and retirement contributions made by the employer on behalf of the employee.
 - (2) The state and the exclusive representative shall jointly survey annually and calculate the estimated average total compensation based on projected average total compensation for the above-named departments as of July 1 of the year in which the survey is conducted. The state and the exclusive representative shall utilize the survey methodology outlined in the "Description of Survey Process Pursuant to Government Code 19827 Regarding the Recruitment and Retention of California Highway Patrol Officers" dated July 1, 2001, and maintained as a permanent agreement between the state and the exclusive representative.
 - (3) Any increase in total compensation resulting from this section shall be implemented through a memorandum of understanding negotiated pursuant to the Ralph C. Dills Act (Chapter 10.3 (commencing with Section 3512) of Division 4 of Title 1). Notwithstanding the foregoing, failure of the parties to reach agreement for a memorandum of understanding pursuant to the Ralph C. Dills Act shall not relieve the state of the duty to compensate sworn represented members of the California Highway Patrol in accordance with the formula set forth in this section.
 - (4) The total compensation for represented sworn members of the California Highway Patrol may deviate from the survey results by mutual agreement between the exclusive representative and the state pursuant to the collective bargaining process.
 - (5) If the provisions of this subdivision are in conflict with the provisions of a memorandum of understanding reached pursuant to Section 3517.5, the memorandum of understanding shall be controlling without further legislative action, except that if the provisions of a memorandum of understanding require the expenditure of funds, the provisions shall not become effective unless approved by the Legislature in the annual Budget Act.
- (b) When determining compensation for state excluded sworn classifications of the California Highway Patrol, it is the policy of the state to consider total compensation for corresponding ranks within jurisdictions specified in subdivision (a), as well as other factors, including internal comparisons.



July 1, 2001

Description of Survey Process Pursuant to Government Code Section 19827 Regarding the Recruitment and Retention of California Highway Patrol (CHP) Officers



Department of Personnel Administration Policy Development Office

1515 S Street, North Building, Suite 400
Sacramento, California 95814

Contents:

Executive Summary of Process
Introduction/background
Methodology
Identifying compensation items to be surveyed
Survey estimates to July 1st
Use of weighted average and additional Information
Survey Contact List–Management
Survey Contact List–Labor
Survey Data Sheet

Attachment A
Attachment B
Enclosed

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF PROCESS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document presents the survey methodology and process for the Department of Personnel Administration's survey of five jurisdictions pursuant to Government Code Section 19827. In addition, this methodology and process is to be used for any future surveys performed under this section.

GOVERNMENT JURISDICTIONS SURVEYED FOR JOB MATCHES

- San Francisco City
- City of San Diego
- Los Angeles County
- City of Los Angeles
- City of Oakland

COMPENSATION ITEMS TO BE SURVEYED

- Salary Range Maximum
- Patrol Bonuses
- Seniority Pay
- Physical Performance Pay
- Post/Education Incentives
- Employee Contribution to Retirement

SURVEY TIMING AND EFFECTIVE DATE

The parties will finalize survey findings prior to March 31st of each year. Per Government Code Section 19827, survey data is projected to July 1st.

USE OF WEIGHTED AVERAGE

Calculations use numbers of employees receiving compensation multiplied by the amount paid and divided by the survey population to produce the "weighted average."

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

This survey is produced by the Department of Personnel Administration, in cooperation with the California Association of Highway Patrolmen (CAHP) pursuant to:

Government Code Section 19827: (a) In order for the state to recruit and retain the highest qualified employees for the California Highway Patrol, it is the policy of the state to compensate state traffic officers the estimated average total compensation as of July 1 of the year in which comparisons are made for the rank corresponding to state traffic officer within the Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office, San Diego Police Department, Oakland Police Department, and the San Francisco Police Department. Total compensation includes, but is not limited to, salary, retirement, health and dental insurance, educational incentives, longevity pay, night shift differential, and other skill or incentive pay. Any increase in total compensation resulting from this subdivision shall be implemented through a memorandum of understanding negotiated pursuant to the Ralph C. Dills Act (Chapter 10.3 [commencing with Section 3512] of Division 4 of Title 1). If the provisions of this subdivision are in conflict with the provisions of a memorandum of understanding reached pursuant to Section 3517.5, the memorandum of understanding shall be controlling without further legislative action, except that if the provisions of a memorandum of understanding require the expenditure of funds, the provisions shall not become effective unless approved by the Legislature in the annual Budget Act. (b) When determining compensation for state excluded sworn classifications of the California Highway Patrol, it is the policy of the state to consider total compensation for corresponding ranks within jurisdictions specified in subdivision (a), as well as other factors, including internal comparisons.

METHODOLOGY

The survey considers salary rates paid to rank and file officers in five California local governments, law enforcement agencies: San Francisco City Police, City of San Diego Police, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office, City of Los Angeles Police, and City of Oakland Police. Both the Department of Personnel Administration and the CAHP have access to information and agree to cooperate in the collection and analysis of data necessary to complete this survey. The parties may review these job matches from time to time, but it is the intent of the parties to utilize the classification in the jurisdiction that most closely matches the "CHP Officer, Range A." The surveyed classes in the local government jurisdictions are currently San Francisco City - "Q-4" classification; San Diego City - "PO II" classification; Los Angeles County - "Deputy Sheriff" classification; Los Angeles City - "PO II" classification; and City of Oakland - "Police Officer" classification.

IDENTIFYING COMPENSATION ITEMS TO BE SURVEYED

In determining 2001 survey findings, the DPA studied compensation items paid to CHP officers and officers in the survey jurisdictions. The DPA and CAHP determined that the significant items to be measured and reported were base salary, patrol and incentive bonuses, seniority pay, physical performance pay, POST and other education incentives, and employee contribution to retirement. The parties agree that any pay or incentive items added to the survey must be significant items in order to be reported in the survey. In the original study, some items were studied but not reported due to the direct comparability of the items between jurisdictions or that there was de minimus effect of those items.

SURVEY ESTIMATES TO JULY 1ST

The parties will finalize survey findings prior to March 31st of each year as data is projected to July 1st. The parties may also provide periodic survey updates thereafter and meet to review findings. Projected figures will take into account salary schedule adjustments occurring on July 1st or during that fiscal year. As an example, if a 4 percent adjustment is to be granted on July 1st, and another 4 percent adjustment on January 1st, then the total impact of the increases for the fiscal year would be 6 percent. This annualized change is based on the 4 percent on January 1st being an annualized 2 percent base salary increase. This annualized 2 percent, when added to the 4 percent increase on July 1st increase, brings the total annualized increase to 6 percent. In the event that a jurisdiction is in the process of negotiating economic terms, the parties may use reasonable projection methods including past history of the jurisdictions and reasonable estimates of anticipated settlements.

USE OF WEIGHTED AVERAGE AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

In reporting data, survey information will be provided by the DPA on an "Excel" spreadsheet using a format provided by the Policy Development Office, DPA. The spreadsheet enclosed with this report shall be the format for presenting survey findings under this section. Further, various worksheets for the determination of various special pay items actually included in the survey findings will be documented on a "Word" format. Agreements reached by jurisdictions engaged in negotiations prior to July 1st would be taken into account.

The DPA will collect compensation and staffing data from the jurisdictions and from the State Controllers' Office (SCO) and the CHP, Office of Labor Relations for CHP Officers. Data will be provided to CAHP and verified. In turn, CAHP will provide salary rates and incentive pays for each jurisdiction based on information provided by the unions and their respective MOUs. The DPA will confirm these figures. Calculations will use the numbers of employees receiving compensation items surveyed multiplied by the amount paid and divided by the survey population to produce the "weighted average."

Salary will be determined by utilizing the top step of the surveyed class in each jurisdiction. Incentive pays will then be added to arrive at a subtotal for compensation before subtracting the employee's contribution to retirement. In jurisdictions where the employee's retirement contribution varies based on age, an average entry age of 24 years will be utilized.

For the City of Los Angeles Police, the survey currently uses an employee retirement contribution rate of 7.5 percent. However, officers hired before 1980 pay 7 percent and officers hired after 1980 pay 8 percent. Over time, there will be fewer and fewer employees hired before 1980. Therefore, beginning July 1, 2003, the survey will begin using an employee contribution rate of 8 percent.

LIST OF CONTACTS, GOVERNMENT EMPLOYERS

Steve Ponder
City & County of San Francisco
Dept of Human Resources
Employer Relations
44 Gough Street
San Francisco, Ca 94103
415.557.4917; Fax: 415.557.4919
ponder_steve@ci.sf.ca.us

Hadi Dehghani
City of San Diego
Civic Center Plaza
1200 3rd Avenue, Suite 300
San Diego, Ca 92101-4107
619.235.5273; Fax: 619.236.5515
Main Number 619.236.6400
hxd@sdcity.sannet.gov

Yusef Khorasane
Los Angeles County
Senior Compensation Policy Analyst
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 526
Los Angeles, Ca 90012
213.974.2549; Fax: 213.621.3172
ykhorasa@cao.co.la.ca.us

Gordon Lawler

City of Los Angeles
Principal Labor Relations Officer
Employee Relations Division
220 N. Main-Room 601-City Hall East
Los Angeles, Ca 90012
213.485.4000
glawler@oars.lacity.org

Shawn Hadnot
City of Oakland
Human Resources Analyst
150 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 2nd Floor
Oakland, Ca 94612-2019
510.238.6892; Fax 510.238.4749
shadnot@oaklandnet.com

LIST OF CONTACTS, LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Jesse Carlos
Field Representative
Association of Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs
213.749.1020

Cliff Ruff
Secretary, Board of Directors
Los Angeles Police Protective League
213.251.4554

Bob Valdan (Board)
Renee Lundberg (Staff)
Oakland Police Officers Association
510.834.9670

Bill Farrar
President
San Diego Police Officers Association
858.573.1199

Chris Cunnie
President
San Francisco Police Officers Association
415.861.5060

California Highway Patrol Five-Jurisdiction Survey Projected to July 1, 2008, Survey Lag Computation

Department of Personnel Administration

A	B	C	D=B*C	E=From Worksheets	F=From Worksheets	G=F*B	H=D+G	I=Frm Worksheets	J=B*I	K=From Worksheets	L=B*K	M=From Worksheets	N=F+I+K+M	O=B*N	P=C+N	Q	R=Q *P	S= B*R	T=P-R
Surveyed Agency	# Officers in Surveyed Class	Max. Rate	Total Cost of Max Salary	Patrol Incentive Unweighted	Patrol Incentive Weighted by Officers Receiving Differential	Total Cost of Patrol Incentive	Total Cost of Max Salary and Patrol Incentive	Seniority Pay Weighted by Officers Receiving Differential	Total Cost of Seniority Pay	POST/Educ. Diff. Average	Total Cost of POST Education Diff. Pay	Physical Perform Pay (PPP)	Total of Patrol+ Seniority+ POST/Ed+ PPP Pays	Verify Special Pays Calc	Salary+ Patrol Seniority+ POST/Ed+ Physical	Employee Ret. Contrib Rate	Employee Retirement Cost	Total Retirement Cost	Net = All Pays - Employee Ret. Share
San Francisco P.D.	1,749	\$8,101	\$14,168,695	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$14,168,695	\$38	\$67,304	\$261	\$457,358	\$0	\$300	\$524,662	\$8,401	7.50%	\$630	\$1,102,002	\$7,771
San Diego P.D.	1,328	\$6,353	\$8,436,138	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,436,138	\$0	\$0	\$432	\$573,505	\$0	\$432	\$573,505	\$6,784	8.37%	\$568	\$754,107	\$6,217
L.A. County Sheriff	7,934	\$6,496	\$51,535,912	\$130	\$20	\$162,130	\$51,698,042	\$73	\$580,964	\$610	\$4,841,868	\$0	\$704	\$5,584,963	\$7,200	6.96%	\$501	\$3,975,613	\$6,698
L.A. City P.D.	6,394	\$6,673	\$42,666,523	\$200	\$121	\$771,721	\$43,438,243	\$140	\$892,648	\$201	\$1,283,378	\$0	\$461	\$2,947,747	\$7,134	9.00%	\$642	\$4,105,284	\$6,492
City of Oakland P.D.	567	\$8,175	<u>\$4,634,969</u>	\$0	\$0	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$4,634,969</u>	<u>\$66</u>	<u>\$37,300</u>	\$153	<u>\$86,487</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$218</u>	<u>\$123,787</u>	\$8,393	0.00%	\$0	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$8,393</u>
			\$121,442,237			\$933,851	\$122,376,088		\$1,578,217		\$7,242,596			\$9,754,663				\$9,937,006	
							\$6,809							\$543					
Survey Total	17,972	\$6,757			\$52		\$6,809	\$88		\$403		\$0	\$543		\$7,300		\$553		\$6,747
CHP Off., Rng. A	5,743	\$6,344			\$0		\$6,344	\$71		\$191		\$113	\$375		\$6,719	4.00%	\$234	\$1,345,152	\$6,484
Projected Lag at 7/1/08																			4.05%

Per MOU, 100% of lag at 7-1-08 provides general salary increase of

4.1%